

NPS52-79-002

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93940

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California



A DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM MODEL

for

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

Ronald J. Roland

November 1979

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Prepared for:

FEDDOCS

D 208.14/2:NPS-52-79-002
Office of Naval Research
Washington, Va. 22217

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California

Rear Admiral T. F. Dedman, USN
Superintendent

Jack R. Borsting
Provost

The work reported herein was supported in part by the
Foundation Research Program of the Naval Postgraduate School
with funds provided by the Chief of Naval Research.

Reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.

This report was prepared by:

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER NPS52-79-002	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) A Decision Support System Model for Technology Transfer		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Ronald J. Roland		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 61152N,RR 000-01-01 N0001479WR90027
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Chief of Naval Research Arlington, Va 22217		12. REPORT DATE November 1979
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 24
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> decision support system DSS MIS management information systems contingency matrix </div> <div> artificial intelligence AI production systems production rules technology transfer </div> <div> GETSIT modules </div> </div>		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) <p>Technology transfer is the process by which technology originating at one institutional setting is adapted for use in another. A major impediment to the implementation of new technologies to assist with managerial decision making problems is a lack of communication between the technology and management communities. Development of a tool designed to bridge the technology transfer gap is the goal of this research. The result will be a prototype software package which may be used on an interactive computer terminal by a manager</p>		

(20 continued)

for assistance in designing a decision support system (DSS).

There are four primary research tasks. These are:

1. Develop a conceptual model of the DSS design process.
2. Select and adapt, or create, appropriate software to mechanize the model.
3. Develop a knowledge base to describe the interactiveness of various organization variables and managerial decision making needs.
4. Collect and analyze interview data and implement resultant production rules on the model.

Tasks one (1) and two (2) have been accomplished and establish the feasibility of this effort. The interview instrument has been developed for task three (3), and representative firms selected for interviews. A prototype production rule model (called DECAIDS for decision aids) which supports managerial decision making was constructed using Stanford University's EMYCIN production rule system. DECAIDS demonstrates the use of production rules to support a relatively unstructured management problem.

A DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEM MODEL
for
TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

Ronald J. Roland
Department of Computer Science
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey CA 93940

ABSTRACT

A Decision Support System Model for Technology Transfer

Technology transfer is the process by which technology originating at one institutional setting is adapted for use in another. A major impediment to the implementation of new technologies to assist with managerial decision making problems is a lack of communication between the technology and management communities. Development of a tool designed to bridge the technology transfer gap is the goal of this research. The result will be a prototype software package which may be used on an interactive computer terminal by a manager for assistance in designing a decision support system (DSS).

There are four primary research tasks. These are:

1. Develop a conceptual model of the DSS design process.
2. Select and adapt, or creat, appropriate software to mechanize the model.
3. Develop a knowledge base to describe the interactiveness of various organization variables and managerial decision making needs.
4. Collect and analyze interview data and implement resultant production rules on the model.

Tasks one (1) and two (2) have been accomplished and establish the feasibility of this effort. The interview instrument has been developed for task three (3), and representative firms selected for interviews. A prototype production rule model (called DECAIDS for decision aids) which supports managerial decision making was constructed using Stanford University's EMYCIN production rule system. DECAIDS demonstrates the use of production rules to support a relatively unstructured management problem.

1. INTRODUCTION

MIS Growth

"Spectacular growth in the use of computer-based information systems and quantitative approaches to managerial decision-making has created a need for both managers who can properly use sophisticated decision-aiding systems and for research towards understanding and designing such systems." (Kenreuther, 1978).

The application and use of automatic data processing (ADP) has become a standard, vital element for the efficient operation of most large, and many not-so-large organizations. Although the decision makers at the mid-and-top-management levels could equally benefit from the capabilities of ADP, the extent to which it has been applied beyond the operational management levels (accounting routines, operations control, production line robots, automatic guidance systems, record keeping, etc.,) is minimal.

For example, the ADP support for the Department of Defense's World Wide Military Command and Control (WWMCC) System consists of a multi-million dollar computer network which provides a high degree of administrative reporting. Another multi-million dollar system is the Navy's Tactical Data System (NTDS), an automated, near real-time combat direction system for clearly defined combat operational roles. These systems reflect the typical use of computerized technology in public applications and are not atypical for the private sector, i.e., massive support for the transaction processing and operational control functions.

Decision Aids

There have been many efforts to describe how a MIS can be built to satisfy (in part) middle and top-level decision making requirements (Keen, 1978; Davis, 1974; Lucas, 1978, Burch and Strator, 1974).

Advanced ADP techniques which could be used in direct support of higher management needs are in the field known as operational decision aids (ODA) or decision support systems (DSS). A decision aid is considered a human-system interface designed for the specific purpose of supporting and enhancing the manager's or commander's decision making ability (Keen, 1978;58-9). It is a tool which can be used by the decision maker to assist in or enhance effective decision making. Although a pen or pencil may be included in this definition the use herein will mean mechanical or electrical (usually computer assisted) devices. Decision aids are generally, but not necessarily, supported by a MIS.

The term operational decision aid is defined within a specific, on-going, research program started in 1973 by the Navy's Office of Naval Research (ONR) to address issues having to do with decisions made by relatively senior officers and their staffs, e.g. task force commanders. The program is aimed at automating certain elements of naval command and control systems. The major components of the ODA program are computer science, decision analysis, systems analysis and organizational psychology (Sinaiko, 1977).

Conversely, decision support system (DSS) is a title used extensively in the open literature. The DSS is computer based support for management decision makers who are dealing with semi-structured problems. The system is usually a collection of levels of support ranging from access of facts to the use of filters and pattern-recognition for information retrieval, simple computations, comparison, projections, etc. DSSs include various models useful to managers (Keen and Scott Morton, 1978;97).

DSS technologies have not proliferated for a variety of reasons, two of which are noteworthy. One is the inability to effect adequate transfer of technology from the research/academic areas to the manager.

The other, and perhaps more important reason, is the lack of a model to describe decision support tools based on given organization variables such as organization structure, managerial style, environment circumstances, organizational needs, and technology.

Technology Transfer

Technology transfer is "the process whereby technical information originating in one institutional setting is adapted for use in another institutional setting," (Doctors, 1969). This transfer is a complex mechanism that involves the coordination of many facets of the technosocio-politico-economic system. "Technology transfer of any significance will only occur when the right people, the right markets, and the right ideas coincide with usable technology at the right point in time," (Kimball, 1967). A major problem for many of today's organizations is the lack of knowledge concerning available technologies that could be applied toward increasing company profits and growth. No management tool currently exists that can be used to effect the transfer of technology from the research environment into managerial application.

Computer science, management science, and communications technologies are now capable of providing decision aiding tools to higher management, but the problems of educating these users in current capabilities and of describing a model to meet specific decision-maker requirements have not been solved. "Many important elements of the manager's planning functions are still not well supported by computerized information systems," (Cleland and King, 1975;146). Education of the technologists has similarly been ignored with respect to their learning the user requirements, needs and capabilities (or lack thereof).

A possible solution to both of these problems is the development and implementation of a model which would describe relevant organization

characteristics in a manager's language, and prescribe characteristics of appropriate decision aiding systems in simple technological terms. A graphical model, or decision table representation, might support such an effort if the number of variables and capabilities were small, however, modeling even a minor part of a manager's decision making situation quickly becomes a very complex task. If current technological capabilities of DSSs are added to the model it is evident that an automated manipulation and analysis capability is needed.

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this research is to develop a prototype computer model which may be used to effect technology transfer. The model will prescribe DSS capabilities based on organizational variables such as available technology, managerial style, environment of the user, timeliness, and task requirements of the decision environment, all of which affect the decision making situation. The model will be designed for managers to use in identifying decision aid capabilities in support of their medium and long range decision making requirements. Concurrently this same model may be used by DSS researchers to identify managers' needs in order to better direct research efforts.

Developed as a prototype, this computer model is presented as a methodology of describing and studying the complex interactions of six organizational variables. Resultant prescriptions presented by this model will consist of a grouping of characteristics or capabilities which should be considered for inclusion in future DSSs planned in support of the described organizational setting. As the organization changes or new DSS capabilities are introduced the model can be updated.

Conversely, given a specific DSS the model will describe an appropriate organizational setting to maximize the effectiveness of using that DSS.

Context of the Research

The context of the research includes several related disciplines. The major, abstract concepts include decision support systems (DSSs), decision analysis, contingency matrix, and production systems. DSSs, previously described, are tools or applications designed and implemented to support specific managerial circumstances.

Decision analysis is a quantitative methodology which permits the systematic evaluation of the costs or benefits accruing from a course of action that might be taken in a decision situation. It includes identification of alternative choices involved, the assignment of values for outcomes and an expression of probability of these outcomes being realized (Barclay et al, 1977;vi). Decision analysis techniques such as multi-attribute theory, prioritization schemes, and decision structuring, for example, have been used as a basis to build many DSSs.

The contingency matrix is used to identify and develop functional relationships among organizational variables. An organization can be defined as a social system consisting of resource subsystems, or energy variables, in an environmental suprasystem working to achieve a set of objectives. Subsequently, contingent relationships are identified and placed appropriately in a matrix fashion (Katz and Kahn, 1966: Thompson, 1967: Churchman, 1968: Shetty and Carlisle, 1972;38-45: Lorsch and Morse, 1974: Kast and Rosenzweig, 1974). Inclusion of decision support system capabilities completes the matrix of the proposed model.

Production systems¹ originated from early work in symbolic logic

¹Riggs (1970;5) described typical production systems as consisting of an input, a conversion process, and an output. As used in this research the input are data, the interpretation of the data is the conversion process, and knowledge is the output or product. More specifically these production systems used in artificial intelligence applications are sets of rules which form premise-conclusion or situation-action pairs and are combined in such a way as to produce information (Winston, 1977;144).

(Post, 1943). A production system is a collection of rules of the form CONDITIONS \rightarrow ACTIONS, (Newell and Simon, 1972; Waterman, 1976; Waterman and Hayes-Roth, 1978), where CONDITIONS are statements about the contents of a data base and the ACTIONS are procedures that may alter the contents of the data base. The system is given a condition to make true, a premise to prove, or, in effect, a question to answer through deductive inference.

Many conceptual organization models and DSSs schemes have been developed. Operationalizing these concepts and models has not been accomplished due to the lack of an adequate tool or device to manipulate such complexity.

Summary

To summarize, this study provides a review of research efforts to build and operationalize decision support systems, i.e., DSSs designed to assist managers at various organization levels with their decision making requirements. It categorizes elements of various decision aids and correlates these capabilities with specific organizational variables in order to examine the context in which DSSs operate. A conceptual six-variable organization framework is proposed where the interrelationships among characteristics of the six variables, and general capabilities of decision aiding systems, are described by a series of IF...THEN production rules. Finally, data are collected and a computer model based on artificial intelligence heuristics (production systems) is created to examine the consequences of various organization - DSS interactions.

II. BACKGROUND

Decision Science

Research in decision science models includes and attempts to integrate

a diverse collection of related fields: organizational behavior and theory relating to the structure of organizations and the human leadership role; traditional management science focusing on planning, scheduling, and inventory; the study of information systems, particularly data base management, decision support systems, and office automation; and the psychology of decision processes, with a focus on risk and uncertainty. Marked by this diversity, this research has a unifying theme: understanding and improving decision-making support. The various disciplines underlying the decision sciences contribute to this objective, not only separately, but synergistically:

- . research in decision processes provides new knowledge about how to adapt problem-solving methods to the needs of the decision-maker.
- . research in management information systems (MIS) investigates how best to provide information for organization decision-making.
- . research in operations research/management science (OR/MS) studies formal models and methods for structuring and solving certain classes of managerial problems.
- . research in social science, especially the behavioral areas, provides insight into the results of human interactions.
- . research in decision support systems (DSSs) carries the promise of integrating these areas through interactive computer-based models.

Thus research in the decision sciences intends to provide a synthesis of the human, the machine, and manipulative designs for decision assisting systems.

Decision Support System

The design of an operational model that incorporates ingredients vital

to the survival of an organization and can prescribe useful decision assisting tools will not only contribute to organizational health but provide an extension of MIS theory. Combining the research of the decision sciences will provide additional bases to support the ramifications and concept of contingency theory (Luthans, 1976).

Decision support systems, in the context of this study, imply the use of computers to assist managerial decision making in semistructured tasks. The DSS is intended to emphasize support rather than replacement of the manager's judgement with an overall goal to improve the effectiveness (vice efficiency) of decision making. DSSs are considered different from MISs or OR/MS tools in that the DSSs:

- . are developed primarily for use by managers and under the manager's control,
- . impact on not-well-structured decision areas, and
- . extend management's capacity to formulate answers to "what if" questions.

Research in DSSs has been concerned with creating a meaningful dialogue between designers and users of interactive computer-based systems. The development and use of "expert systems" to support DSS designs may be the first step toward integrating the technologist, researcher and user (Feigenbaum, 1978). An expert system can be described as a computerized system that relies on the incorporation of a large amount of human knowledge in a data base which can then be interrogated to provide suggested actions or decisions. These systems often use techniques of artificial intelligence such as production rules, to provide choice options to the decision maker.

The expert system may be illustrated by looking at the MYCIN program developed at Stanford University (Shortliffe, 1976). MYCIN is an interactive, question-answering computer system which involves the user in identifying

specific infections in humans. It then provides suggested diagnoses and treatment. MYCIN integrates the ability to answer the question "Why?" during and after each exercise. It will also store and retrieve cases for future reference. MYCIN incorporates the concepts of decision analysis within the framework of artificial intelligence (AI) production rules. Expert opinion was, and is, provided by medical doctors who specialize in the field of microbiology.

The Portfolio Management System (PMS) like MYCIN, was designed and implemented with specific user requirements defined, (Keen, 1978; 101). The PMS is a computer graphics-based system with a variety of fairly simple models operating from a large, complex data base. It is designed primarily to be used by investment managers of large banks. While PMS is considered a DSS, as is MYCIN, their structures are totally different yet the results are very similar, i.e. direct support for the decision making function.

Williams (1978) provides generic descriptions of other similar but different decision aiding technologies. In one case decision structuring was used to aid decision making with respect to movement of a large naval force to evacuate personnel (civilian and military) from Lebanon. Another DSS, based on prioritization schemes, was used to prepare budget submissions to Congressional committees. These examples illustrate how organizational management was provided an extended capability, through the availability and use of an automated DSS, to manage resources under continued conditions of uncertainty and tension.

There are several other examples of the design and application of similar systems (see Hart, 1978; Little, 1975; Meador, 1974; and Kruzic, 1978). The distinguishing points about each of these circumstances are that:

1. the user (manager) is, or was, operating under pressure in a complex task.
2. the DSSs incorporate a detailed methodology by defining and assessing the process of managerial decision making.
3. the decision processes are multi-dimensional, multi-objective, and only a part of the task can be automated. Computer support is used to manipulate data and display information.
4. the DSS technology provides managers with access to computer power, gives fast response, and is easy to use.
5. computer support, carefully matched to the decision problem, the decision makers ability, and the decision context, substantially helped the manager.

Controversy

A certain amount of theoretical controversy surrounds the subject of this study. Early MIS efforts were highly criticised for advertising a capability beyond anything that could be delivered (Deardon, 1972;90-99). Clearly, Deardon had identified many weaknesses, e.g., the "total" systems approach, centralization arguments, homogeneity of management information, etc., in the optimism of some technologists. Deardon's thinking persists in many areas and supports the resistance to change in trying to introduce DSS technologies or even learn about them.

The expanding role of computer applications and concurrent reduction in the cost of hardware since 1972 has greatly broadened the views of both the technologists and user communities. Coupled with changing environments, better educated users, tight economies, and ever narrower profit margins, increasing the effectiveness of decision making is a high value item.

Technology alone, however, is not enough because the dynamics of today's organizations do not permit such independence. Theoretical issues

or organizational phenomenon influence the construction and use of various aids (Nolan, 1975). Unless relevant organizational attributes can be identified and their interactiveness described in some way very few executive level decision aiding system will evolve.

111. PROPOSITIONS

The major proposition of this study is that the capabilities of effective decision support systems can be predicted by describing the organizational framework within which the DSSs exist or are planned. Conversely, characteristics of organizational variables can be described in a manner that will enhance the success of specific DSS designs. In order to support these propositions it is necessary to identify capabilities which describe decision support systems and select specific organization related variables which, taken as a whole, are representative of an organization-decision support system framework. Once identified these capabilities and variables can be so arranged as to suggest success or failure of proposed DSS-organization combinations.

Modrick (1976) provided an illustration of efforts to integrate decision aiding systems into military tactical decision making. His research results indicate the need for "adaptive decision aiding systems" engineered to fit specific decision making situations. Additional support to suggest how organizational variables directly affect DSS requirements is provided by Spector, Hayes, and Crain (1976). Their investigation of the impact of computer-based decision aids on a high level management staff resulted in identification of several significant relationships. In one instance (1B1D, pp. 3-22) it was noted that the direction of communications within the Staff were dependent on the informal (leader centered) staff structure. In this instance as the organization structure became less, centralized communications became less predominantly downward to more

laterally directed. The DSS capabilities included in automatic message handling and distribution could be used to support this structure as the continuum of communication requirements moves from basically downward to lateral. Simon (1965;104) summarizes this perspective:

"Organizational form . . . must be a joint function of the characteristics of humans and their tools and the nature of the task environment. When one or the other of these changes significantly, we may expect concurrent modifications to be required in the organizational structure -- for example, in the amount of centralization or decentralization which is desirable."

A model depicting organizational situations can be useful for understanding decision support system capabilities appropriate to assist the organizational decision maker. Complexity of the initial model can be reduced by considering a limited number of variables and determining their interaction. Once these interactions are understood additional variables and their interactions can be introduced and studied. This proposal emphasizes the initial implementation of the variables group, environment, task, structure, individual and environment.

A minor proposition is that operationalizing initial interactions of the DSS and original variable characteristics would be possible, albeit time consuming, by manual means. As the knowledge base is enriched with additional characteristics and interactions, however, a computer model will be required to effectively evaluate the data. The use of an interactive computer model used by a manager to facilitate user interaction (retrieval and update) is appropriate and desirable.

This study provides the basis for identifying capabilities to design and build automated decision aids in support of specific managerial

requirements. The thrust of this study, operationalizing a prototype computer model to enhance effective DSS design and implementation, also provides insight for future research. Finally, intra-organization attributes, their interactions and descriptions, both general and specific, and what constitutes the field of DSS is documented.

IV. HYPOTHESES

Introduction

It is generally hypothesized that by changing the characteristics of selected organizational variables while holding others constant, relevant DSS capabilities will be identified. Conversely, it is hypothesized that a change in a corporation's DSS capabilities may suggest a change in one or more of the organizational variables. Hypotheses have not been developed as to what extent the relationship between the predictor (independent variable) and the outcome (dependent variable) will be influenced by other factors (the intervening variables).

In a more formalized sense the hypotheses may be stated as:

1. If appropriate organization variables are identified and manipulated, one result will be to suggest corresponding changes in that organization's decision support system(s).
2. If the decision support system capabilities change then corresponding organization changes may be suggested in order to effectively utilize the DSS in question or under investigation.

There are at least two findings expected from this research. First, it is expected that there will be a positive correspondence between the rigidity of the organizational structure and the location of DSSs within

the organization. Secondly, it is expected that under many circumstances relatively simple DSSs will be highly effective and satisfy many complex organizational decision support situations. Other relationships are provided below to exemplify the hypotheses that may be explored by identifying the interactions of organization-decision support system combinations.

1. If the organizational task is composed of well structured problems then there will be minimal need for a DSS.
Conversely, if the task involves a high degree of ill structured problems several DSSs may be identified.
2. If the individual (leader) is not skilled in technical analysis then DSS support will be delegated further down in the organization than otherwise.
3. If the individual (leader) is knowledgeable in technical and decision analysis methods then a higher degree of DSS support will be identified than otherwise.
4. If the organization structure is either pyramidal or divisional in nature then analytic decision aids are appropriate.
5. If the structure is pyramidal then real-time decision aids will be most appropriate.
6. If large screen displays are identified then the structure is most likely pyramidal.

V. MODEL DEVELOPMENT

Contingency Matrix

The contingency matrix concept described by Luthans and Stewart (1976) can be used as a structure to initially describe the interactions of organizational variables. The matrix will function as a means of

- - - - -
Figure 1 goes about here
- - - - -

driving the form of the model developed in this study and will in itself be a first step in assisting decision-makers and technologists in the task of defining and designing future DSSs in some coordinated manner.

The characteristics of the organization variables; Group, Environment, Task, Structure, Individual and Technology (which I refer to as the GETSIT variables), and their inter-relationships and intra-relationship with DSS capabilities will comprise the matrix. These GETSIT variables were selected to describe the general organization, and no claim is made that this is the only possible way to describe an organization, nor is it necessarily the best way. It is suggested, however, that the GETSIT framework is rich enough to provide a useful and relatively complete model. A result of this study may be the determination that fewer variables will be adequate.

Specific DSSs will not be included in the model, only general capabilities, of which the following is a partial list for example purposes.

- large scale computer support
- regular reporting
- time-sharing
- real time capability
- batch processing
- single data base
- centralized data
- single or multiple languages, and
- display groups
- .
- .
- .




Figure 1

A GENERAL CONTINGENCY MATRIX FOR MANAGEMENT

Luthans and Stewart, 1978

GETSIT-DSS Relationships

Figure 2 illustrates a continuum perspective of how the GETSIT-DSS relationships might be conceptualized. The six horizontal lines represent

- - - - -

Figure 2 goes about here.

- - - - -

continuuums of organization variables ranging between limits of specific variable characteristics. The outer left and right columns illustrate possible decision aid capabilities that would support the organization variable along the continuum. Certainty factors, assigned probability functions, are used to quantify the certainty of given organization-DSS characteristics being appropriate depending on the position along the six continuuums a manager's perceived position is located. The interaction even at this simple level is complex when the number of possible combinations is considered.

Figure 3 represents some suggested characteristics and then only a very small number of them. Taking the variable STRUCTURE from Figure 2

- - - - -

Figure 3 goes about here.

- - - - -

to illustrate system complexity, a two dimensional contingency matrix is presented as Figure 3. While still incomplete, the magnitude of possible interactions is apparent. Expansion of this matrix to include the other five variables and all their interactions becomes a practical impossibility to manipulate by manual methods.

As these interactions begin to take some form then the production system (rule) methodology must be used instead of the contingency matrix to mechanize the model.

GETSIT-DSS Continuum

ORGANIZATION VARIABLES

<u>DSS</u>			<u>DSS</u>
. Large Scale Computer	STRONG LARGE	NEW WEAK SMALL	. multiple types of displays
. Regular reporting	STABLE OLD	CHANGING UNSTABLE	. Individual or personal terminals
. Little need for real-time			
. No time-share	STABLE PREDICTABLE	UNSTABLE DYNAMIC CHANGING	. Multiple sensor data coll. systems
. Batch orientation		UNSTRUCTURED	. "What if" ques'
. closed ADP org.			
. Single large DB	WELL DEFINED PROGRAMMABLE	ILL DEFINED VARYING	. Mult. data base
. Centralized	SIMPLE REPETITIVE		. Decentralized
. single language			
.	LINE	MATRIX PROJECT	.
.			.
.			.
	DICTATOR AUTHORITARIAN	DEMOCRATIC WEAK	
	INDIVIDUAL INDIVIDUALISTIC LONER		
	LOW	HIGH	
	SINGLE TECH i.e. 360/67	MULT. TECHNIQUES FRONT LINE	

Figure 2

CONTINGENCY MATRIX FOR STRUCTURE

ORG. VARIABLE	VARIABLE CHARACTERISTIC	DSS CHARACTERISTICS							
		REAL TIME	TIME SHARE	AUTO MSG	GRAPHICS DISPLAY	ALPHA DISPLAY	AUDIO ALARM	LARGE SCALE DISPLAY	
GROUP	FORMAL:							X	
	FORMAL: LINE STAFF FUNCTIONAL MATRIX UNK					X	X	X	
STRUCTURE	INFORMAL:								
	CENTRALIZED								
	CONSULTATIVE		X						
	TRANSACTIONAL								
	DELEGATED								
	DECENTRALIZED								
TECHNOLOGY	HIGH								

Figure 3

Figure 4 illustrates the means to structure the characteristics of organizational variables into production rules. These rules then define

PRODUCTION RULE EXAMPLE

IF Environment is dynamic, and
Task is low cost, and
Task is high priority, and
Structure is consultative

THEN Suggested DSS capabilities include
Individual displays,
Automated message handling,
Real time support, and
Consulting service is recommended.

Figure 4

a subset of DSS capabilities which would satisfy the originally described interactions. Each of the 6 GETSIT variables will be assigned characteristics derived from the research. Character sets may or may not be independent. In addition, the characteristics themselves may be modified by the model user at any time. A specific example of this is visualized is provided in Figure 5.

- - - - -

Figure 5 goes about here.

- - - - -

PRODUCTION SYSTEM MODEL

VARIABLE

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

SPECIFIC

(EXAMPLES)

Group

$G_j, j = 1 \text{ to } g$

$G_1 = \text{Formal}$

Environment

$E_j, j = 1 \text{ to } e$

$E_1 = \text{Turbulant}$

Task

$TA_j, j = 1 \text{ to } ta$

$TA_1 = \text{Semi-structured}$

Structure

$S_j, j = 1 \text{ to } s$

$S_1 = \text{Centralized}$

Individual

$I_j, j = 1 \text{ to } i$

$I_1 = \text{Skilled}$

Technology

$TE_j, j = 1 \text{ to } te$

$TE_1 = \text{High}$

DSS

$DSS_j, j = 1 \text{ to } n$

$DSS_1 = \text{Real-Time}$

$DSS_2 = \text{Time share}$

$DSS_3 = \text{Graphics display}$

$DSS_4 = \text{Not needed}$

$DSS_5 = \text{Tutorial}$

$DSS_6 = \text{Individual display}$

·
·
·

Possible Production Rules:

1. IF $G_2, G_3, TA_{12}, S_1, I_{22}$ AND TE_9
THEN DSS_2, DSS_6, DSS_{219} AND DSS_{300} .
2. IF E_2, TA_3 AND S_4
THEN DSS_1 AND DSS_{100} .
3. IF $DSS_1, DSS_2, DSS_3, DSS_4$ AND DSS_{31}
THEN G_3, E_4, TA_5, S_6 AND TE_{93} .

Figure 5

Summary

The concept of the contingency matrix is adequate to discuss the GETSIT-DSS model, however, the complexity of organization-DSS variable relationships is such that automated support is needed to implement a model that will reflect real-world interactions. An initial framework of six organization variables is described. A production system, based on concepts of artificial intelligence, is proposed as a means of modeling the complex relationships among these variables and their associated DSSs.

A prototype hardware-software system has been designed and implemented. The decision aids system, DECAIDS (Buscemi and Masica, 1979) provides alternative DSS capabilities based on user-described GETSIT characteristics. DECAIDS was constructed using Stanford University's EMYCIN production rule system and ARPANET resources at the University of Southern California's Information Sciences Institute. It (DECAIDS) demonstrates, in an on-line interactive mode, the use of an AI production rule system in support of a relatively unstructured management problem.

Access to this system for demonstration purposes may be arranged by contacting the author. A later paper will describe specific findings of the research, implementation details of DECAIDS, and knowledge base contents.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barclay, S., R. V. Brown, C. W. Kelly, III, C. R. Patterson, L. D. Phillips, and J. Selvide, Handbook for Decision Analysis, Decisions and Designs, Inc., 1977.
- Burch, J.G. Jr., and F. R. Strator, Information Systems, Hamilton, 1974.
- Buscemi, T., Jr., and M. Masica, A Prototype Production Rule Program for a Decision Support System, a masters thesis in Computer Science, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA 93940, June 1979.
- Churchman, C.W., The Systems Approach, Delta, 1968.
- Cleland, D.I., and W.R. King, Systems Analysis and Project Management, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.
- Davis, G.B., Management Information Systems, McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Deardon, J., "MIS is a Mirage," Harvard Business Review, Jan-Feb. 1972; 90-99.
- Doctors, S.I., The Role of Federal Agencies in Technology Transfer, Cambridge, The MIT Press, 1969;3.
- Feigenbaum, E., Chairman of Computer Science Dept., Stanford University, Presentation at the Naval Postgraduate School, Oct. 1978.
- Hart, E.P., R.O. Duda and Einaudi, A Computer-Based Consultation System for Mineral Exploration, SRI International, Palo Alto, CA, 1978.
- Kast, F.E., and J.E. Rosenzweig, Organization and Management: A Systems Approach, McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Katz, D., and R.L. Kahn, The Social Psychology of Organizations, Wiley, 1966.
- Keen, P.G.W., and M.S. Scott Morton, Decision Support Systems, Addison-Wesley, 1978.
- Kimball, C., "Statement for Hearings before the Subcommittee on Science and Technology of the Select Committee on Small Business," 90th Congress, 1st Session, Sept/Oct. 1967;42.
- Kruzic, P., Introduction to the OPINT Software Package, Decisions and Designs, Virginia, February 1978.
- Kunreuther, H., Chairman of Decision Sciences Dept., Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1978.
- Little, J.D.C., "Brandaid," Operations Research, 4;23, May 1975;628-673.
- Lorsch, J.W., and J.J. Morse, Organizations and Their Members: A Contingency Approach, Harper and Row, 1974.
- Lucas, H.C., Jr., Information Systems Concepts for Management, McGraw-Hill, 1978.

- Luthans, F., Introduction to Management, McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Luthans, F., and T.I. Stewart, A General Contingency Theory of Management, unpublished paper, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1978.
- Meador, C.L., and D.N. Ness, "Decision Support Systems: An Application to Corporate Planning," Sloan Management Review, 15:2, Winter 1975;51-68.
- Modrick, J.A., "Decision Support in a Battlefield Environment," Proceedings of Workshops on Decision Information for Tactical Command and Control, Thrall and Assoc., Houston, TX, 1976, pp 260-276.
- Newell, A., and H.A. Simon, Human Problem Solving, Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Nolan, R., "Thoughts About the Fifth Stage," Data Base, Fall 1975.
- Riggs, J.L., Production Systems: Planning, Analysis, and Control, Wiley, 1970.
- Shetty, Y.K., and H.M. Carlisle, "A Contingency Model of Organization Design," in Wortman and Luthans (eds) Emerging Concepts in Management, MacMillan, 1975.
- Shortliffe, E.H., Computer-Based Consultation: MYCIN, American-Elsevier, 1976.
- Simon, H.A., The Shape of Automation for Men and Management, Harper & Row, 1965.
- Sinaiko, H.W., Operational Decision Aids: A Program of Applied Research for Naval Command and Control Systems, Manpower Research and Advisory Services, Smithsonian Institute, Washington, D.C., 1977.
- Spector, B.I., R.E. Hayes and M.J. Crain, The Impact of Computer-Based Decision Aids on Organization Structure in the Task Force Staff, CACI, Inc., Virginia, 1976.
- Thompson, J.D. Organizations in Action, McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Waterman, D.A., and F. Hayes-Roth, "An Overview of Pattern-Directed Inference Systems," Pattern Directed Inference Systems, D.A. Waterman & F. Hayes-Roth (eds.), Academic Press 1978.
- Waterman, D.A., An Introduction to Production Systems, The RAND Corporation, Chp P-5751, 1976.
- Williams, L.R., Modern Approaches to Decision Making, U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, 1978.
- Winston, P.H. Artificial Intelligence, Addison-Wesley, 1977.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

✓ Defense Documentation Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	2
✗ Library Code 0142 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	2
Office of Research Administration Code 012A Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	1
LtCol Ronald J. Roland, USAF Code 52R1 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940	40
✗ Mr. Rex Stout Naval Electronics Systems Command Code 3301 Washington, D. C. 20360	1
✓ University of Hawaii Attn: Prof. R. Sprague College of Business Administration Dept. of Decision Science 2404 Maile Way Honolulu, HI 96822	1
✗ Director Advanced Research Projects Agency 1400 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22209	1
✓ Chief, Systems Effectiveness Branch Human Engineering Division Attn: Dr. D. A. Topmiller Wright Patterson AFB, OH 45433	1
✗ Mr. Richard Heuer Methods & Forecasting Division Office of Regional and Political Analysis Central Intelligence Agency Washington, D. C. 20505	1
Director, Social Science Research Institute University of Southern California Attn: Dr. W. Edwards Los Angeles, CA 90007	1

✓ Perceptronics, Inc. Attn: Dr. A. Freedy 6271 Variel Ave. Woodland Hills, CA 91364	1
✓ Stanford University Attn: Dr. E. Feigenbaum Stanford, CA 94305	1
✓ Decision Analysis Group Stanford Research Institute Attn: Dr. E. Sacerdoli Menlo Park, CA 94025	1
Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, Inc. Attn: Dr. W. W. Royce Sunnyvale, CA 94086	1
✓ Lockheed Missiles and Space Company, Inc. Attn: Mr. D. Ruskins Sunnyvale, CA 94086	1
✓ Chief of Naval Research Arlington, Va 22217	2
✓ Mr. Leonard Marks, Jr. Castle and Cooke, Inc. Box 3928 San Francisco, CA 94119	1
✓ Director, Engineering Psychology Programs Code 455 Office of Naval Research 800 N. Quincy St. Arlington, VA 22217	1
✓ Director, Mathematical & Information Science Air Force Office of Scientific Research Building 410 Bolling AFB, D.C. 20332	1
Thomas H. Lee 4330 East West Highway Bethesda, Maryland 20014	1

<p> ✱ Dr. Glen R. Allgaier Naval Ocean Systems Center San Diego, CA 92152 </p>	1
<p> . Dr. George E. Pugh 1500 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 810 Arlington, Virginia 22209 </p>	1
<p> ✱ Gordon B. Davis 645 Business Administration Building College of Business Administration University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 </p>	1
<p> Dean R. Lycas 1501 Alcoa Building Pittsburg, PA 15219 </p>	1
<p> ✓ Don Rector Computer Systems Division 3255-3A Scott Blvd Santa Clara, CA 95051 </p>	1
<p> ✱ Ronald R. Blue Martin Marietta Aerospace Bethesda, Maryland 20034 </p>	1
<p> . Michael L. Donnell Decisions and Designs, Inc Suite 600 8400 Westpark Drive McLean, Virginia 22101 </p>	1

U189877

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY - RESEARCH REPORTS



5 6853 01068126 5

U18987